

ACEC-INDOT Bridge Inspection Committee Meeting Minutes

Time: January 29th, 2021, 9:00am-10:50am

Location: Microsoft Teams Virtual Meeting

Minutes Prepared by: Jonathan Olson, BF&S

The following were in attendance:

Andrew Fitzgerald, INDOT – Chair	John Lukac, HWC
Scott Minnich, United Consulting – Vice Chair	Anne Rearick, INDOT
Jonathan Olson, BF&S – Secretary	Bill Dittrich, INDOT
Stephanie Moore, INDOT	Rob Coop, USI Consultants
Jennifer Hart, INDOT	Pat Connor, LTAP
Stewart Kline, IACHES (Tippecanoe County)	Sharon Street, INDOT
Michael Vereb, Lochmueller Group	Adam Post, INDOT
Bobby Chandler, Clark Dietz	Randy Strain, INDOT
Timothy Barkey, IACHES (Adams County)	Alfred Wessling, BLN
Maricar Gonzalez, INDOT	

The following were absent:

Anthony Marino, INDOT	Jose Ortiz, FHWA
-----------------------	------------------

Meeting Summary:

1. INDOT Bridge Inspection Workshop II and NHI Feedback – Andy
 - a. 2021 Bridge Inspection Workshop
 - i. Took place online on January 22, 2021
 - ii. Approximately 170 participants
 - iii. 3 PDH's for participants
 - iv. Committee members had positive feedback for workshop
 - b. December NHI Refresher Course
 - i. 30 participants (max)
 - ii. Was online
2. Potential Training for 2021 – Andy
 - a. Recommendations:
 - i. BIAS topics
 - ii. Test bridge – Jonathan mentioned this could be helpful
 - iii. Critical findings – Bill mentioned this was important due Federal non-compliance for critical findings
 - iv. Load rating (BRADIN)
 - v. Hydraulics

- vi. Bridge Asset Management
- vii. BIAS Admin Training – Bill mentioned that this needs updated. Shari is currently reviewing past training.
- viii. Scour training – John Lukac mentioned this could be helpful
- b. Next Bridge Inspection Workshop 2021 – TBD
- c. 2021 NHI courses:
 - i. 2-week course – INDOT to possibly host in the spring
 - ii. S-Brite (fracture critical) – Likely to be held later this year. Need to check with Rob Conner at Purdue
 - iii. A few consultants mentioned they had a couple inspectors that need the 2-week course, the 1-week course, and the S-Brite training.

3. Metric 23 Overview – Andy

- a. Federal review was overall good – need some improvement
 - i. LPA related – items 6, 7, 11, and 21
 - ii. Substantial Compliance – Items 6, 7, and 11
 - iii. Non-compliance – 21
- b. Item 6 - Inspection Frequency – Routine – Lower Risk Bridges
- c. Item 7 – Inspection Frequency – Routine – Higher risk bridges
- d. Item 11 – Inspection Frequency – Frequency Criteria
- e. Item 21 – Inspection procedures – Critical Findings
 - i. Issue notifying FHWA of critical findings
 - 1. Steps have already been taken for automatic notification from BIAS when a critical finding is submitted.
 - ii. Issue with timely close-out of critical findings
 - 1. This was the biggest issues. Make sure critical findings are being addressed. You can have counties take pictures of repairs; doesn't always require visit to site in order to close-out.
 - iii. If you are unsure if it should be filed as a critical finding, you can discuss it with INDOT first to get their assistance.

4. LPA Contracts – Stephanie

- a. 50 contracts due this year
 - i. Current breakdown of contracts
 - 1. 15 in year 1, 6 in year 2, 21 in year 3, 50 in year 4
 - ii. Proposed breakdown utilizing 2-year contract
 - 1. 15 in year 1, 26 in year 2, 21 in year 3, 30 in year 4
- b. Survey was sent to LPAs
 - i. 78 LPA responses
 - ii. Are LPAs willing to do 2-year contract?
 - 1. 23 said yes, 22 no, 32 maybe
 - 2. Some larger counties that said yes, like Marion, may not get to switch.
 - 3. Tim Barkey had concerns with higher Phase I costs back-to-back.

- a. Jonathan mentioned that costs between Phase 1 and 2 will be more comparable going forward. The last contract cycle had especially high Phase I costs due a one-time load rating of all bridges.
 - 4. Tim also had concerns with the increase in time spent contracting.
 - a. Stephanie said that yes, there would be additional time spent contracting.
 - 5. Counties may also loose out on extended frequency inspections in Phase II (if they have any) by doing the 2-year contract.
- iii. Are LPAs willing to participate in a district-wide bridge inspection contract?
 - 1. 17 said yes, 36 no, 25 maybe
 - 2. This idea was brought up by INDOT as a possible way to increase federal compliance. It is a very preliminary idea at this point without any details. The questions went out to see if there was any possible interest to see if INDOT should pursue this idea further.
 - 3. Andy mentioned the potential benefit to smaller counties, especially with high turnover for ERC position. All the administration of the contract would be handled by INDOT. Consultants would still be doing the inspections, not the state inspectors. INDOT would select the consultants, not the LPA. There would be multiple counties in one contract. This solution would not be forced on anyone, it would be an option for LPAs that want to do it.
 - 4. Bill mentioned that with new proposed federal regulations a new bridge may have to be inspected before they are even open to traffic. In order to stay in compliance, INDOT can't wait for consultants to get supplementals from the LPAs to go do initial inspections. An on-call inspection consultant could potentially help keep that metric in compliance.
 - 5. Pat asked about what end products the LPAs would get; would they get an inspection book? Stephanie responded that if that is what they needed, then yes, they could get that, but no details have been talked about at this point.
 - 6. Pat asked if district-wide inspections would address the compliance issues. INDOT stated they thought this would help address it.
 - 7. Jonathan mentioned that this would be a fairly major change and it would be important to have consultants, LPAs, and INDOT come together to develop a solution together. A committee task group might be one way to handle that.
 - 8. Concern was expressed over LPAs not having the ability to select their consultants, about this potentially restricting smaller consultants from being able to pursue these larger contracts, and about potential inspection date conflicts/issues with multiple counties grouped into one contract. Grouping counties together into one contract might require

some counties to move compliance months to help balance the schedule.

9. Stephanie mentioned that LPAs would still have to pay 20%, which is the same as what they are paying now, but there might be some cost savings if consultant is doing multiple counties together under one contract.
10. It would save counties time as they would not be responsible for advertising, contracting, or invoicing. They would just have to pay the bill.

c. Advance NTP

- i. Stephanie asked if this is effective. Consultants say this is working well.
- d. Alfred asked about including costs for initial inspections in contracts to avoid supplementals. Jonathan mentioned that you can include initial inspections in the current contract under the interim phases.
- e. Stephanie said she is having issues with open reports in BIAS. Stephanie will start cracking down on these. Consultants will be notified first, but LPAs will start being notified for repeat offenders.
- f. There are 50 RFPs for bridge inspections going out this year. All are scheduled to be posted by July. They will be advertised in order of compliance month. March compliance months will go out in February, and so on. If any counties want to advertise early, she will let them. Many of the RFPs this year will be for the 2-year contracts. Stephanie will confirm which LPAs are doing 2-year contracts on the upcoming LQR meetings.
- g. John Lukac mentioned that it would be good if INDOT educated consultants on some of the state's compliance issues via NTP letters or other means.
- h. Bill mentioned that the problem is not usually that bridges are not being inspected, the problem is that data is not being updated in BIAS in a timely manner.

5. ACEC Committee Members – Andy

- a. Alfred Wessling of BLN – committee voted to add him to committee.
- b. We have one spot left for a consultant. Some potential consultants to add:
 - i. American Structurepoint
 - ii. JSE
 - iii. VS Engineering
 - iv. RQAW
 - v. SJCA
- c. Scott, Jonathan, and Andy will send out application to potential consultants.

6. Website and Bridge Inspection Manual – Andy

- a. Bridge Inspection Manual has been updated. There are now 9 parts. When memos are released revised sections will be highlighted in the manual. At end of year, highlights in the manual will be removed and the memos will be archived.
- b. Randy discussed Part 6 – Scour
 - i. Scour critical bridges must have POA

- ii. If assessment indicates critical finding – must have critical finding
- iii. Bill mentioned an error in BIAS – some scour assessment forms change to channel profile form. Will need to un-approve the form to see it.
- iv. New Scour POA forms in BIAS are required to be used. This isn't currently stated in the manual, and it will need to be updated to say that.
- v. BIAS also includes forms to track the scour monitoring after the trigger event has occurred.

7. Team Leader Qualifications – Bill

- a. Bridge Inspection Consultant (BIC) minimum qualifications
 - i. Currently Team Leaders have to get refresher training every 10 years. New regulations may drop that to every 5 years.
- b. Sometimes inspectors aren't always being notified of new team leader number. Team Leader number is in address line 3 in BIAS. INDOT was renewing hundreds of applications, and some may have been missed. Notify them if you see something incorrect.

8. Other items

- a. Bill stated that as he starts reviewing data for the federal submittal, you may start getting emails about data issues that need to be corrected. Please correct these items in a timely manner.
- b. Jonathan petitioned to have the final meeting minutes sent to ACEC so they could be posted on ACEC's website and notices sent out via email. This would be in addition to being posted on INDOT's Bridge Inspection website. The committee voted to approve. Jonathan, as secretary, will be sending meeting minutes to ACEC.
- c. Jonathan asked Stephanie what version of the LPA contract was going to be used on the contracts being advertised this year. Stephanie said that hopefully the new proposed contract will be used, not the one currently posted on the website. That proposed contract still needs approval from the contracts group at INDOT.
- d. Bill and Rob – There have been some problems with new bridges in BIAS and not being able to see them. They are trying to get this resolved with Bentley. Let INDOT know if you can't see a new bridge that INDOT has created.
- e. Scott Minnich asked about the timeline of the new Bridge Inspection Application System (BIAS). Andy said an advertisement for that is out now. Selections probably won't be made until June or July. This item will be discussed further at our next meeting.

9. Next meeting

- a. Next meeting will be April 30th, 9am, on Microsoft Teams. Andy will be sending out an invite.